Social Progress

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Asia is an area which is not only in a process of change but in a process of storm. I am referring to the inner changes that are taking place all over the world no doubt, but perhaps more so in Asia than elsewhere. . . . We have been entangled in past things and time has passed by and we have not kept pace with it. And so we have suddenly arrived at a stage when we have to run—walking is not enough—and in running we stumble and fall and we try to get up again. It is no good to tell us to walk slowly, because we just cannot do it slowly, not even for outside or other forces. We realize, especially in an aged continent like Asia, that running involves risks and dangers, but there is no choice, for there is a torment in our minds and there are all kinds of questions before us which we seek to answer.— **Jawaharlal Nehru, in Opening Address, Lucknow Conference. From *Asian Nationalism and the West*, edited by William L. Holland. Used by permission.**

Perspectives from the Far East

MAY 1956

Vol. XLVI, No. 9

Social Progress

Published by the Department of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., to provide a forum for the Church on subjects of social concern for Christians. It includes program resources, legislative developments, and guides to worship, study, and action for leaders of social action groups in local churches, presbyteries, synods, presbyterial and synodical societies. Articles represent the opinions of the authors—not the official policy of the Department of Social Education and Action or of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

CONTENTS: May, 1956

An Open Letter to Ministers 3

From This Vantage Point 4

Articles

What About Miss Lucy? *Correspondence from the Far East* 5

China After Six Years, *by the Institute of Social Studies* .. 7

The U. S. and India Can Agree, *by L. Edward Shuck, Jr.* ..11

Silliman Studies Social Action, *by Paul T. Lauby* 16

Conversations in India 21

Echoes 28

Department of Social Education and Action: Clifford Earle, Margaret E. Kuhn, H. B. Sissel, Gayraud Wilmore; Helen H. Harder (Editorial Assistant), Helen Lineweaver (Director of Washington Office). Editorial correspondence should be addressed to Clifford Earle, Secretary and Editor.

Counseling Committee on Social Education and Action: Joseph J. Copeland, Mrs. Edward Fisher, Arthur W. Mielke, Henry Lee Willet, Frank T. Wilson, Chairman, Paul S. Wright; Mrs. Roland P. Beattie, Richard Pacini, Shelby Rooks; Walter H. Eastwood, John A. Mackay; Emery Bacon, Mrs. Werner J. Blanchard, C. Elwood Boulware, Herbert N. Brockway, William Adams Brown, Jr., Burton Fowler, Paul K. Justus, Paul Lehmann, Franc L. McCluer, Mrs. Harold R. Tolliver, Edmund S. Wolfe, and Willem F. Zuurdeeg.

Published monthly, except August, by the Department of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at 1009 Sloan St., Crawfordsville, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial and Executive office, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Subscriptions, $1.00 a year; three years for $2.50. Single copy, 15 cents. Group rates on request. Send subscriptions to 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Copyright, 1956, by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

An Open Letter to Ministers:

A recent survey in one of the larger synods of our Church indicated that an overwhelming majority of Presbyterian ministers were in sympathy with almost all the positions of General Assembly. It also revealed that these ministers found very few and severely limited ways to express their concern in the program of their churches. We feel that one reason for this may be a lack of assurance on the part of ministers that lay leaders are receptive to an interpretation of the gospel that relates it to specific political, economic, and social issues.

If this is true, a greater effort must be made to increase the depth of social concern and understanding among lay leaders in the churches. We believe that the social expression of Christian faith is today the touchstone of its relevance to our common life. The vitality of the Church is not only measured by such expression but actually depends upon it.

We are therefore making a special effort to reach more lay leaders across the country through SOCIAL PROGRESS. *For this reason we have inserted a subscription blank in the center of the magazine and would urge each minister to encourage the leaders in his church to take advantage of the low group rates listed on page 31.*

—The SEA Staff

From This Vantage Point...

As THIS is being written Clifford Earle, the Secretary of this Department, and Frank Wilson, Chairman of the Counseling Committee, are in Borneo on their tour of Presbyterian and United Nations projects in the Far East. Their experiences and some of the people they have met have been more than interesting and revealing—they have proved dramatically how closely and indivisibly the interests and events of East and West are bound together. Developments in Alabama, in India, China, and the Philippines—however separated by space and time—interact upon each other. They all take place in one world—God's world.

In this issue letters from Dr. Wilson and Mr. Earle, and articles by Asian nationals and authorities on the Far East, disclose among other things how similar human beings are with respect to their fundamental hopes and fears, and how different they may be in the external expression of them. We wonder, for example, how many American theological students (graduated or not) will be able to avoid identifying themselves in the survey of social attitudes among Philippine seminary students (page 16).

Training for Integration

LAYMEN and ministers seeking help as they contemplate integration of their church or community should consider now the possibility of attending the Eighth Annual Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations. This five-day study seminar, sponsored by the National Council of Churches, will be held at McCormick Seminary in Chicago, July 30 to August 3. A limited number of scholarships are available from this Department. If you are interested or desire further information, write to the Department of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

—The SEA Staff

What About Miss Lucy?

***Manila, March 20**—For the past six weeks I have visited twelve cities in five Asian countries. At every place I discovered that the University of Alabama and the citizens of Tuscaloosa have made Miss Autherine Lucy the most popularly discussed American name in Southeast Asia. In every conversation, whether with students or labor leaders or teachers or missionaries or newspaper correspondents or members of the Japanese Diet, the inevitable question would come—"What about Miss Lucy?"*

What about *Miss Lucy? This is not Alabama's question alone; it is America's question. If one part of us makes all the rest of us look so bad and feel so small, then all of us together must remake the total pattern.* (From a letter from Dr. Frank Wilson, Dean of the School of Religion, Howard University, and Chairman of the Counseling Committee on Social Education and Action.)

Editors' Note—In the light of Dr. Wilson's observation, it is not surprising to learn of the action of a senior high school class in Japan. We reprint herewith a letter sent by this class of ninety-four girls to the student body of the University of Alabama. The teacher's account of how the Japanese students came to express themselves follows their letter.

Osaka Jo Gakuin
Osaka, Japan
March 4, 1956

Dear Friends,

We Japanese girls would like to speak to you, with love in Christ, the students of Alabama University, who are far beyond the ocean.

We learned by newspapers what has lately happened among you. And now our minds are full of sorrows. For we have firmly believed that there are no more people who are to suffer too much only for their "colored" skin (especially those who want to be intelligent and good American citizens) since the Civil War was over long ago. We heard that a colored girl was rejected the hope to study together with you in your campus. Knowing this, we cannot let the matter pass before us without a word.

All the girls in our class made up their minds to send a letter to you about the problem.

As you know quite well, we are the children of the Lord God. Are we not brothers and sisters who were born in this world in a great plan of God? No matter how we sometimes forget this, it is still true. . . .

We pray that the far-reaching love that was taught by Jesus and has been witnessed by many people will be done among you. And may God's love enfold you warmly and release you so that you may be again with a smile to anyone who does want to be one of your companions.

Yours in Jesus,

(Signatures of the 94 members of the second year of the Senior High School in Japanese and English)

Shinonomecho, Higashi Ku
Osaka, Japan
March 15, 1956

Dear Mr. Earle:

Regarding the development at the University of Alabama, it is significant to note (*a*) the interest of youth in social problems—particularly human rights, and (*b*) the ways in which young people feel the need to *practice* the techniques of social action in order to gain confidence in themselves, and need to be *helped* in acquiring these techniques, especially in the Orient where self-expression has been frowned on as being in very bad taste.

The girl who introduced the subject for class discussion rather "stuck her neck out." At the beginning of the class she asked if it would be possible to bring up a problem for discussion instead of going on with the regular assignment. I gave assent, so she proceeded to review the Alabama incident and wanted to know what *I* thought of it.

Here was a golden opportunity for me. After briefly stating that I believed that Miss Lucy had received anything but Christian or democratic treatment, I asked her to go on with what she had in mind. Later I asked for suggestions and opinions from others. No response—so I realized that the other girls were aghast at what they considered the effrontery of their classmate in making such uncomplimentary remarks about the country of their foreign teacher. But I urged them to think about what they as Christians might do, even though this was a problem in a country five thousand miles away.

The first girl suggested sending a letter. The group voted on this possibility—with quite a large number refraining. So I talked with them about the need for responsible participation in democratic government and they voted again; this time all voted in favor of sending the letter. This was probably the first experience of direct social action by the girls of this Japanese school and, I believe, a real learning experience.

Later I was able to use this class action in a chapel talk based on one

of Howard Thurman's selections in his *Meditations for Apostles of Sensitiveness*. I will quote it here so that it may be used elsewhere:

"In one of Petrarch's letters of Old Age appear these words: When a word must be spoken to further a good cause, and those whom it behooves to speak remain silent, anybody ought to raise his voice, and break a silence which may be fraught with evil. . . . Many a time a few single words have helped further the welfare of the nation, no matter who uttered them; the voice itself, displaying its latent powers, sufficed to move the hearts of men."

And it was in this way that the concern of a single girl gave rise to the action of ninety-four girls speaking out for "justice and righteousness."

Sincerely yours,

Alice Grube, Fraternal Worker in Japan, Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

By the Institute of Social Studies

China After Six Years

***Hong Kong, February 2**—In the evening we met with three young men who are indeed, and will one day be recognized as such, among the leading "intellectuals" of free China. I will not mention their names because I could so easily, and innocently, say something about them or report what they said in such a way as to place them in danger.*

They are the leaders of a group (of eleven men) who call themselves the Institute of Social Studies. It is not a carelessly formed group. Its purpose has become clearer since it was composed in 1952. It is a research and study group—with considerable "action" in the way of magazine articles and pamphlets. The purpose is to discover, outside of Communism, a "third" way for Chinese people. In 1952 when Communism was in its most expansive mood (in the Orient) and the Kuomintang (Chiang and Company) was in its most feeble phase, many leaders were ready to form a "third" party. This group felt that such a development would be premature. They saw the need for study and research related to the economic and political development of the Chinese people. So the project was born.

The group has two characteristics. First, they saw the need for study leading to action, and they were confident that they could fulfill the need. Others saw the need, but had no faith in themselves, no driving purpose, no follow-through. Secondly, they engaged in the adventure out of deep personal interest and commitment. Other young "intellectuals" are writing "on assignment" for various parties and groups, mostly foreign. There is diversity

within the group, but apparently complete honesty, and an intense sharing of their common goal.

They support themselves by free-lance writing. Yet all their writing is done within the purpose of their project. The Peking Government already is aware of their activity. Last summer, for example, the Red China Government went out of its way to "refute" something that emanated from the "Hong Kong circle" and had appeared on the mainland.

They are determined to set up criteria for the study (and criticism) of Communism and other social forms that are not based on the West. They read everything the West has said and is saying, in the economic and political fields, of course, but they want their standards to represent the Asiatic mind.

The conversation was most intense. We (Frank Wilson and I) asked the questions. Andy Roy did the interpreting, with an occasional assist from his wife. I took notes. It was a most rewarding evening for us who want, so quickly, to have some newer and deeper insights into the East-West encounter.

Perhaps last evening we were talking with a future prime minister of the New China.—(From a letter from Clifford Earle.)

WHAT changes have been made in China since the Communists took over the mainland six years ago?

The changes have been too drastic; they have shaken heaven and earth. Look at the economic system: the "State" has monopolized every economic artery in the country, and every aspect of the people's economic life is controlled. State ownership has become the mainstay of the national economy. Private commerce and industry, individual handicrafts, and agriculture are increasingly speeded along the path of "transformation." By 1958, only State ownership and "collective ownership by the working masses" will remain; and, since production in the collective phase of the economy must be carried on in accordance with the "State Plan," this plan is in reality only a form of State ownership. Thus, it is correct to say that nationalization includes *everything* in the economic structure of the Chinese mainland now.

Foreign Relations

It is well known that China in the past rather leaned toward the West. Now that mainland China has been transformed into a vital link in the Communist world, it has become anti-Western. This contrast with its former pro-Western attitude is another great change brought about by the Communists.

Changes in the Cultural Field

In the field of culture, changes have been vast and total. The most noticeable feature is the substitution of materialism for Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism as the orthodox point of view in China. The Communists have made every effort to transform the ways of life and thinking of the Chinese people, even

at the subconsciousness level, with the purpose of assuring a position of absolute authority for Communism in China.

This is the real picture of Communist China: the unlimited control by the State over economic life on the one hand, and the unlimited control and rigorous transformation of human thinking on the other.

It seems beyond belief that materialism could have wiped out every trace of traditional thought, particularly Confucianist, which had deep roots in China for more than two thousand years. Yet this is an accomplished fact, whether one likes it or not. Materialism has come into power and pushed Chinese culture into a new stage, which naturally makes us all apprehensive.

The Family

Everyone knows that Chinese society has been based on the family system, the concept of "family" being its focal center. It is highly doubtful that the Communists can completely *destroy* such a long-enduring system, but they have altered it beyond recognition.

Certainly, the family—the big family, or clan—has been the basis of Chinese society for several thousand years. Confucianist teachings have been most emphatic on the role that should be played by the family, and on its position in China. However, following the enforcement of the Agrarian Reform Law, the common property of every family was dissolved, the elders and their authority were overthrown, sons brought charges against their fathers and brothers against one another until the large-family system thoroughly collapsed. Then the new Marriage Law, which enabled women to sue freely for divorce, came into force. This destroyed the traditional system of marriage. Now it is clear that the traditional family pattern in China, the Confucianist type of family, has gone out of existence.

New Source of "Cohesiveness"

Now that the family has collapsed, is Chinese society like a lot of loose sand, lacking internal unity?

No. The Party and the State have absorbed every member of the old collapsed families. Take the peasant, for example: he was drawn into the Peasants' Association during the period of Agrarian Reform, and then into the Agricultural Production Cooperative when the nation-wide collective movement was pushed rapidly forward. Some of the peasants were organized into cadres [corps of trained officials or staff leaders], or absorbed into the Party or the Youth Corps. Women and children joined Women's Associations and Pioneer Corps. In a word, the Communists aim at keeping the people under control through every possible organization and making them loyal to the Party and State instead of to the family and the parents.

What is really happening in the minds of the people? Are they, as the Communists hope, entirely loyal to the Party and to the State, and willing to turn over everything to them?

Fundamentally the people on the mainland stand in a contradictory relationship to the State. Among the workers, for example, since 1953, there have been widespread evidences of disappointment, negli-

gence, and even sabotage. Overtime labor and greatly reduced wages have made the workers resentful. Even the senior cadres in the Party admit that "State interest is in contradiction with that of the individual" and emphasize that labor disciplines must be intensified. The workers are not so submissive as the Communists had hoped.

The Peasants

The condition of the peasants is still worse and their resentment is more acute. The *compulsory purchase* of farm products and the collection of taxes in kind have exceeded the capacity of the peasants to comply; the countryside has been suffering and near starvation. Even the Party has had to admit that the cadres have discovered that the national interest and the interests of the peasants are in opposition, and have found it difficult (that is, have lacked the moral courage) to persuade the peasants to accept the *purchase program.*

The Intellectuals?

The situation among the intellectuals is still more striking. The Communists have already found that their pressure upon the intelligentsia has had serious consequences. Most of the intellectuals have adopted the tactic of negative boycott and have obstructed the development of various programs. Because of this, the Communist Party was forced to call a meeting of its Central Committee in January of this year in order to revise its policy and allay the resistance of the intellectuals.

Other Groups

What about the members of the Party, the Youth Corps, and the cadres?

Their situation is more complex. They are unsettled in both mood and outward expression. On the one hand, as workers for the State, they have special privileges; on the other hand, their parents and relatives are peasants, workers, or businessmen, so that in their hearts there is bitterness. At times they cannot help obeying the orders of Party and State and sacrificing the interests of their own parents and relatives. At other times they make every effort to resist the State or the Party in order to preserve their own relatives' interests.

This contradiction in the minds of these cadres can be partly explained by the example of the shift to agricultural co-operatives.

The Chinese Communists have put out vigorous propaganda to the effect that the rural cadres and the peasants are eagerly supporting the movement toward collectivization. The facts, however, disprove this claim. Many cadres in the countryside have made strenuous efforts to compel their fellow peasants to join the rural co-operatives, while seizing upon the principle of "voluntariness" to cover their own family members' escape from the collective drive. The compelling of others is for the sake of obeying orders and preserving their own special privileges, whereas allowing their parents and relatives to evade the matter is to enable them to avoid the losses involved in joining. This is the clever way the rural cadres solve their "contradiction," but it also reveals their

mood of frustration (and it is a solution that doesn't solve anything).

It is therefore clear that, if the Chinese Communist Party in the course of its development runs into a serious impasse, no small part of the cause will be this contradiction between the State and the people.

The Institute of Social Studies, established in 1952 in Hong Kong, is composed of a number of young Chinese scholars in Hong Kong and the U.S.A. Its purpose is to seek a new path for China, and by concentrating on fact-finding and research on "Chinese problems," particularly Communist affairs, it hopes to find a sound basis for further study of theoretical problems.

—Author's note

The U.S. and India Can Agree

By **L. EDWARD SHUCK, JR.**, *Director of Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, Honolulu, Hawaii.*

Reprinted from **The Silliman Journal**, *April, 1955*

THERE is no more unfortunate element in present-day politics than the apparent drifting apart of India and the United States. The critical jousting between Indians and Americans in the realm of foreign policies can encourage the growth of fundamental differences between these great powers. In recent months irresponsible journalism in the United States and Communist journalism in India seem to have widened the cleavage.

To find a reason for such differences we search in the realm of feeling, not of economics, and for varied interpretations of passing events, not for any truly fundamental contradictions in political philosophies. Economically, India and the United States should by all logic be complementary and co-operative. Culturally, there remains deep and lasting respect in the United States for the great contributions that Indian civilizations have made and are making. Americans like to believe that of the thousands of Indians who know the United States through personal experience or close study the overwhelming majority have liked what they found.

Leaders of both nations often seem to overlook a most glaring set of political facts of life in this modern world: So long as there exists Western civilization, the United States promises to be the most decisive power center of that civilization. Conversely, India holds tenaciously to key manipulative powers so far as the minds of Asians are concerned. The inevitable deduction

from this set of facts is that irrespective of Communism, world peace depends upon the co-operative action of the United States and India. The United States will retain little influence in Asia if it is unable to improve its relation with India. Conversely again, India's present and future influence in the West is vitiated so long and to the degree that its leaders misunderstand and misinterpret the United States. It is quite plain that these two powers must cooperate and "coexist."

There is, happily, considerable recent evidence that India and the United States are really closer together than superficially notable, as far as the most constant factors of politics are concerned.

To set the plot, one might point out that it is indeed difficult for nearly all Americans to understand how even the most casual student of the fifty-year history of Bolshevism rampant can conclude that the movement—whether masterminded locally by Lenin, Stalin, Khruschev, or Mao—is anything other than a grotesque denial of the structure of human values so richly matured through centuries of Christian, Moslem, Buddhist, and Hindu culture. These are the values for which Pandit Nehru, among others, has pre-empted the role of spokesman and defender. It is further difficult for Americans to understand how anyone can assume that "coexistence" or "co-operation," or even the very agreement to sentimentally worded memorandums, are desired by Communists for any reason other than to use such documents and phrases as instruments for the gaining of complete power over the coexisters. The very concepts of compromise, mutual respect for varying points of view, divided political power, and co-operative endeavor are quite antithetical to Leninism-Stalinism-Maoism.

Holding to these ideas, Americans have perhaps too easily become contemptuous of that section of Indian opinion which holds coexistence to be something other than a conceptual absurdity. To an American, an honest man might say, "I should rather my country be given over to the Communist Party than that harsh words and violence be invited by my trying to thwart the ends of the Party." But it hardly seems either intelligent or honest to think that one can coexist with Leninism-Stalinism and the aggressive organizational and military power it has engendered. Americans think, to use a Leninist thought process, that Indians and others who would coexist on a basis of equality with Bolshevism—whether defined in Russian or Mandarin—fail to understand the proper and intimate relationship between theory and practice. Such coexisters reveal, it is held, a gross and dangerous misconception of theory which leads them to crude errors in the matter of tactics. Coexistence involves on the part of its non-Communist supporters an inexcusable misunderstanding not only of the theory and practice of Bolshevism, but, for that matter, of the theory and practice of democracy as well.

Indians, bruised by centuries of Western imperialism, refuse easily to concede, on the other hand, that the United States does not act in the

ancient tradition of that feared imperialism. Similarly, many Indians interpret "imperialism" as a word solely applicable to the West. India's defenses against imperialism seem to be all turned Westward; and the modernization of these defenses is difficult indeed. Substantial sections of Indian opinion are sincerely out of sympathy with the American policy of attempting to quarantine the Communists. The Indians remain convinced that Communist imperialism, if it exists, must be contained only by moral force.

It is now obvious that alongside the policy of the United States to quarantine Bolshevism and to fight it politically as an international cancer, the Government of India is adopting parallel methods dedicated to similar ends. India is now a chief protagonist of the non-Communist effort to contain and to define the limits of Communist aggression by treaty or by a series of treaties.

To explain this we must revert in thought to the Nehru-Chou Agreement of June, 1954. The most bald fact about that Agreement, and one which has been easily overlooked in the heated exchanges between Americans and Indians, is that Mr. Nehru succeeded in building a cage around the Maoists, a cage built with the political and social values of the non-Communist world. That Agreement, often called the Delhi Pact, was drawn in the idea-words of democracy, not of Communism. The Red Chinese were enticed to accept limitations on their activities which, if adhered to in practice, would vitiate all that international Communism represents. In calling upon the Chinese Communists to abandon a policy of expansion into borderlands of China through subversion directed toward foreign governments, Mr. Nehru succeeded in getting Chou to promise to do exactly what Mr. John Foster Dulles would make certain that he must do.

It is doubtful that Mr. Dulles could hope to get any more restrictions placed on Chinese policy than those Mr. Chou has promised Mr. Nehru that he will accept. The Indian Government has become the guarantor for restricting the Red Chinese in exactly the same degree as the Americans would restrict them. Mr. Nehru would deny any effort on his part to co-operate politically with the United States in the job of containing Communist imperialism, it can be assumed, but the effect of the Delhi Pact is quite close to that. The variance from the complete lies in the degree of faith which, respectively, the Americans and the Indians place on the two methods being adopted by their Governments.

At least Mr. Nehru is no longer neutral to the problem of containing Communist expansion. He has enlisted the moral and political power of India to that task. The Delhi Agreement denounced policies, aggression and internal subversion, which are neither intended nor being implemented by any Communists. Regardless of the continuing civil war within the Chinese society, the non-Chinese in Asia—during this era—are threatened by none but Red Chinese. The Communists have thus permitted Mr. Nehru to put verbal brakes to their policies, while limiting not one because of the policies of Western democratic nations.

By defining the methodological framework in which the Communists must operate, Mr. Nehru has demonstrated to the onlooking world that he is indeed non-Communist. By forcing Chou En-lai to agree to a standard of political activity which is essentially democratic—American and Indian—Mr. Nehru has placed the Indians in the role of umpire and evaluator of Red Chinese actions. The Indians have become direct participants in the world conflict as guarantors of the good conduct of the Red Chinese and their overseas agents, instead of attempting to remain on the side lines .... Mr. Nehru has obligated himself to explain to the world at all times that Communist actions do not violate the word or spirit of the Delhi Pact. Because of the non-Communist character of Mr. Nehru and of the Indian Government, such a situation, we have every reason to assume, cannot but guarantee the support of India for the broad aims of American policy in Asia. Specifically, these include the maintenance of mutual respect for the established practices of international law and respect for the procedures which govern the comity of nations—principles which have so far been systematically spurned and violated by Communists on the basis of Leninist principle. It is indeed good, from an American point of view, to have Mr. Nehru's help after such a long period of misunderstanding and tension.

The tacit dismissal of any "neutrality" on the part of the Indian Government is merely as it should be. Those who speak of the possibility of Indian neutrality in great conflicts which grip the entire world are either using the word in some peculiar and limited fashion or they are speaking without adequate background or understanding of the dynamics of politics. India, like the United States, is a great power. And no great power—certainly neither the United States nor India—could possibly be "neutral" in the major currents of world politics, irrespective of the emotional desires of the statesmen involved. In a given contest, lack of aid to one of the protagonists on the part of the United States or of India is exactly tantamount to the offering of aid to the other contestant. Moreover, a "third force" mentality is obviously a positive aid to one side or the other, depending upon the dynamics of the struggle at any given point in time. It is gratifying to those who have long had faith in Indian leadership that the Indian Government has recognized the absurdity of any claim on the part of a great power to be "neutral" with respect to the problem of Communist aggression.

With the Nehru-Chou Agreement at hand, then, it is quite difficult to comprehend wherein there lies any substantial disagreement between the long-run political desires in Asia of the United States and those of India, so far as Bolshevism is concerned. Both Governments desire to contain potential Communist aggression and to prevent Communist-led conspiracies from overthrowing governments. The United States Government, because of bitter experience in two generations of dealings with Bolshevist governments, acts on the principle that such a containment of Communist expansion must be based on defensive military strength and

upon a system of military-economic alliances among the potential victims of that threatened aggression. The Indian Government retains to date the hope that Communist imperialism can be contained by the moral force of bilateral agreements, at least among the major powers—agreements irrelevant to objective facts of military and organizational power. As a would-be protector of the territorial integrity of non-Communist Asia, the Indian Government would employ the device of posing itself as the moral policeman of China, armed with a signed document rather than with military force.

The two methods—American and Indian—by no stretch of the imagination can be termed mutually exclusive. They are at least complementary. They are both based upon honest desire or upon experience. From an American point of view, one's Indian friends must grant Americans the privilege of carrying out a policy which fifty years of first-hand experience with Bolshevism has convinced Americans to be the most efficacious when one is dealing with Leninism-Stalinism. If the Indians prefer, on the other hand, "to have another go at it" purely at the level of Locarnolike moral sanctions, more power to them. Perhaps they can succeed even though the rest of us have failed. In logic, it is granted, everyone else's failure does not mean that India's failure is inevitable.

A test of the Indian theory was carried out at Bandung. At the juncture of the Bandung Conference, Nehru had either to remain true to his chosen role and proclaim some general adhesion to the spirit of the Nehru-Chou pact of June, 1954, or suffer a political reversal. Any retreat from June, 1954, could have gravely injured Indian prestige—far more, incidentally, than it could harm America's rather bruised prestige in the Orient. There is that drawback to the use of so-called moral sanctions. When one adheres to such grand absolutes, the fall from grace is the more embarrassing. For Nehru and India any substantial retreat from the spirit of the Delhi Pact would result in considerable loss of face.

The usually forgotten element in developing Indian-American relations is the important fact that American and Indian ends, in so far as Communism is concerned, remain quite similar. Naturally, in a democratic community of nations, diversity in methods is the rule. Tolerance must be developed by both Indians and Americans as they attempt to pursue agreed-upon goals along parallel but differing paths. Whether immature American journalists can forgo the pleasure they seem to derive from "Nehru-baiting" remains a big *if*. Likewise, Nehru reveals both a similar distorted pique and an unexpected immaturity of political outlook when he blindly beats the corpse of nineteenth century British imperialism while the world is gravely threatened by twentieth century Bolshevist imperialism.

The crux of the matter is that the ultimate political ends of India and the United States are very close to being the same. Only Bolshevism gains from the bitter exchanges with which Indian-American relations have been littered during recent years.

Silliman Studies Social Action

RELIGION may damage communities as well as improve them. Which of the two consequences will be typical depends upon the common form of its expression. A few years ago thoughtful churchmen in America were startled by a study published by E. L. Thorndike which showed that in a sample of cities covered there was an inverse correlation between religious activity and community welfare. Where the membership of churches was greater, the index of general community goodness—including such factors as infant health, educational opportunities, high wages, good government, and the absence of slums and child labor—was lower. On the other hand, where there was apparently less interest in organized religion, there tended to be greater evidence of community well-being. While churches may not have injured their communities, at least they had not in general done anything conspicuous to improve social conditions.[1]

Further evidence to support the same conclusion has been more recently accumulated by A. L. Porterfield, a sociologist who is personally sympathetic to the Church. Using procedures similar to those of Thorndike in a study of states rather than cities, his statistics pointed to the same conclusion. Those states in which there was a high percentage of ministers, churches, and church members tended to be the least desirable states in which to live, while those with less religious activity by and large had high social welfare ratings.[2]

It would seem quite apparent that were such objective studies made in Philippine communities the results and conclusions might be much the same. It is obvious that organized religion can make unusual contributions to the transformation of community life. Yet in general it has not done so. The only possible conclusion is that too few churches have been effectively concerned about community conditions. All too often the church has been otherworldly or individualistic in its interest. There are numerous indications of this. Take, for example, Christian hymnology. A large downtown church in Los Angeles, California, which broadcasts its Sunday services, recently took a poll of its membership and radio listeners to determine their favorite hymns. The two hymns receiving the highest number of votes were "In the Sweet By and By" and "When the Roll Is Called Up Yonder I'll Be There." In the official hymnal of the United Churches of Christ in the Philippines there are but four hymns out of a collection of 198 that voice any degree of social aspiration. Unfortunately the Church possesses

[1] E. L. Thorndike, *Your City*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1939.

[2] "The Church and Social Well-being," *Sociology and Social Research*, January-February, 1947.

By PAUL T. LAUBY, *member of faculty, College of Theology, Silliman University, Philippine Islands.*
Abridged from The Silliman Journal, *April, 1955*

an appallingly small number of hymns and litanies to express social concern.

A study of the programs of our Philippine Protestant churches reveals that the average parish church is quite indifferent to the practical problems of the community, and is therefore irrelevant to the crucial issues facing the nation. The most neglected function of the church is that of community reformation. . . . While community action begins at home, it does not end there. The concern of the Church must be as wide as the needs of the least member of the family of mankind.

When community responsibility is thought of in its broad sense, it is all the more obvious that the traditional program of the average Protestant parish, consisting of Sunday school classes, a morning worship service, a Wednesday evening prayer group, and perhaps a women's society meeting, is far from adequate to meet the demands of the modern Philippine community. The church must learn to engage in definite action in all areas of social life. Without descending to unworthy devices, both individual churchmen and the church as an institution must now develop the requisite skills of practical action.

But it is apparent that before this can happen attitudes must be changed, and it is equally obvious that these changes in attitude must first take place among the clergy. One important phase of this problem is the matter of inculcating proper attitudes into the minds of theological students. Today's theological students are tomorrow's pastors and religious educators.

This leads to the question: What are the underlying attitudes of our present theological students relative to the church and social action? An answer to this question is the purpose of this study.

The analysis of the attitudes of Silliman University theological students that is being set forth here is based upon the results of an opinion questionnaire that was administered by the writer to 108 of the 118 qualified Filipino students in the College of Theology during the school year 1954-1955. The questionnaire included fifty items and was devised to measure the opinions of students in a wide range of social relationships. The student was able to indicate his reaction to each question in one of four ways. He could indicate agreement or disagreement; if he was unable to make a decided judgment, he was permitted to check an appropriate column; and if he felt he possessed insufficient knowledge about the problem, he was able to indicate this fact also.

The Yes and No type of opinion questionnaire has very basic limitations as an accurate measurement of attitudes and convictions. It is obviously difficult to give an unqualified Yes or No answer to many questions, nor does this type of questionnaire measure the intensity of

conviction. The intensity with which a person holds any view is of extreme importance in an accurate measurement of attitudes. This is one of the reasons for the fatal error made by the Literary Digest *poll before the 1936 Presidential election in the United States, and the conspicuous miscalculations of certain subsequent Gallup polls.*

Most research experts agree, however, that a carefully devised Yes and No questionnaire, while it should be interpreted with reservations, can indicate quite accurately the general trend of thinking of any given group, if the sample is truly representative. The conclusion that the data gleaned from such a questionnaire is in general valid, seems to be justified.

Social Backgrounds of Theological Students

The questionnaire was prefaced with a statistical section which has revealed some interesting, if not surprising, facts. One prevalent idea is that our theological students are much too young for professional training. This study reveals that the average age for Silliman theological students for the year studied was twenty-four (the median age was twenty-two).

The questionnaire revealed that the present theological students do not come from the lowest economic class. Only 14 students indicated that their families did not own land, while 93 indicated land ownership.

There are 30 farm families reported in the study, but only one of these does not own its own farm, reflecting the fact that our theological students are coming largely from the emerging middle class.

The fathers of the theological students are engaged in 23 different vocations and professions. Farmers comprise the largest group, ministers the next largest, and teachers and businessmen follow as the third largest group. Only 2 fathers were reported unemployed.

Seventeen of the students come from Roman Catholic families, and 2 from homes where the father is Roman Catholic. Eighty-eight come from evangelical families and 77 of these have grown up within a Protestant Church. In a very real sense, then, the attitudes expressed by the students reflect the prevailing attitudes of the families and churches from which they come.

One of the disturbing revelations of this study is the apparent lack of knowledge on the part of many students about public issues in the Philippines. For example, almost 48 per cent of the students were unable to make a judgment about the Nationalization Act due to lack of essential knowledge. In the case of the Japanese reparations issue, over 28 per cent were unable to indicate a personal reaction for the same reason. The questionnaire also reveals rather widespread unfamiliarity with such provisions as the Rice Share Tenancy Act and the Minimum Wage Law.

Attitudes on Community Outreach

It has already been indicated that the community program of the average parish church is narrow and restricted, but the results of this study provide real hope for a much wider community outreach. Over 96

per cent of the students feel that the Church should concern itself with the economic and social problems of the nation. The reactions to specific questions reveal that the preponderance of students are personally favorable to a wider social outreach on the part of the Church. Over 95 per cent favor the parish church having a social action and welfare committee to make definite plans for the church's ministry to the community. Seventy-three per cent favor the organization within the church of classes where social and political issues are studied and discussed.

The results of the questionnaire reflect a surprisingly liberal attitude in regard to new areas of interest for the church. An overwhelmingly large percentage of students feel that the church should provide a program of leisure time activity for its members (93 per cent), that it should provide instruction in scientific farm methods (93 per cent), and that the church should organize campaigns to register new voters and teach literacy classes so that more citizens can qualify as voters (89 per cent).

The preponderance of students believe that the church should take the leadership in organizing credit unions and co-operatives (90 per cent). Seventy-two per cent favor the establishment of church-administered factories where work is provided for members during seasons of unemployment or underemployment. Perhaps most surprising of all, 68 per cent favor the development by the Protestant churches of a program of planned parenthood education, with a specific emphasis upon proper techniques of birth control.

Except for a few outstanding examples, parish churches in the Philippines are not engaged in many of these activities and projects. Yet one of the disconcerting facts that come from this study is the apparent satisfaction on the part of the students relative to the present influence of the church in community life. Over 75 per cent of the students believe that Protestants by and large exercise a significant influence in community affairs. It is difficult to know upon what basis such a reaction is made.

There is a real question as to whether the average theological graduate has the initiative or the technical skills and leadership to put many of these ideas into action. But it is encouraging to find that many of them do recognize the importance of a wider community outreach and a more functional church program, and that they rather wholeheartedly favor progressive innovations.

Attitudes on Economic Problems

This study reflects some interesting viewpoints on economic issues. Almost 10 per cent of the students indicated that they believe God has created human society so that there will always be poor people and wealthy people. Over 18 per cent were undecided about this matter. In the light of the fact that historically this idea has been a rather conspicuous assumption on the part of many Christians, it is arresting that the number of students who subscribe to it is not higher.

Certain sociologists have pointed out that the average barrio family is content with too little—content with

inadequate housing, substandard diet, and few conveniences to lessen the drudgery of farm life. So one of the prime problems is to stimulate the barrio people to desire more material goods for their physical and cultural well-being. After defining this problem in the questionnaire, the following question was asked: Do you think it is advisable for the church to encourage its members to want more of the material things of life? Only 56 per cent felt that this was a legitimate emphasis for the church to make, and over one fourth of the students definitely felt that the church should not stimulate the desire within its members for a higher standard of living.

The students also were asked to indicate their attitudes toward the Minimum Wage Law and the prevailing working conditions. In answer to the question as to whether the Christian had a moral obligation to refuse to patronize stores or factories where the employees were not paid the minimum wage, almost 48 per cent felt that a Christian did have such an obligation. Only 30 per cent felt that the Christian did not have such an obligation. However, it is extremely doubtful whether such a high percentage actually act upon what they feel is a clear obligation. Another item in the questionnaire was worded in this fashion: It is usually agreed that a church should discipline a member who habitually gets drunk. Do you feel that the church is also obligated to discipline a member who habitually refuses to treat his employees or tenants fairly? Eighty-nine per cent answered that the church has such an obligation, and only 9 per cent indicated they felt it does not. Here again, it is obvious that this principle is rarely acted upon in the average church where employers are members.

It is interesting that 61 per cent of the students feel that intensive social dissatisfaction and unrest exist among the farmers and workers in the Philippines. As an economic side light, it will perhaps be of interest to mention that 70 per cent think that a full-time parish minister should receive at least the national minimum wage, while 23 per cent feel that this is not necessary.

Attitudes on Basic Social Evils

One of the revealing results of this study is the indication of what the students feel are the most glaring social evils facing the country. The questionnaire listed eight prevalent social evils: political corruption, drinking, excessively high interest rates, gambling, low farm income, poor soil and unscientific farm methods, unemployment, and lack of proper Sunday observance. The students were asked to rank these problems in the order of their importance as forces of social sickness.

Using as an index the total number of votes a social condition received in the first, second, and third places, political corruption was ranked first with 67 votes, gambling second with 56 votes, and drinking third with 41 votes. Unemployment received 40 votes, and the lack of proper Sunday observance ranked fifth.

It is arresting to note that severe problems such as high interest rates, low farm incomes, poor soil and un-

(*Continued on page 25*)

A small portion of Clifford Earle's voluminous correspondence relating some of the experiences he and Frank Wilson have had while visiting India

Conversations in India

Allahabad, India—March 24, 1956. Most of the morning was spent at the Literacy House. Here are maintained a writing and publishing program, a research program, and a literacy training center. The whole thing is based on the Frank Laubach method of teaching illiterates to read and write. It is a program of mass adult education related to the needs, especially in the villages and rural areas, of the Indian people.

I should emphasize the "social action" importance of this program. The goal is "better village life" through literacy. The present program recognizes the weakness of earlier literacy efforts in India, which failed because no continuous supply of appropriate literature was provided for those whom the program reached. Now a growing number of extremely useful pamphlets are available, as well as a most interesting fortnightly magazine. The subjects treated are largely in the areas of citizenship, family life, health, community sharing, etc. One pamphlet, *We the Government*, received a recent national award. Hundreds of workers (who come to the place in small groups for short courses) are being trained as literacy workers in the villages of India. The literature, by the way, is called "social education" material.

Shortly after 6 o'clock we returned to the home of Dr. Chatterji of Holland House for a meeting of the Progressive Club. This is an informal group (judges, professors in Ewing Christian College and in the University of Allahabad, a few clergymen and "progressive" missionaries, local government officials), interested in social and political problems. Frank and I were introduced and made brief statements about our trip and the kind of problems that interest us. Then there was discussion. The men felt free to speak their minds, to voice their disappointment concerning American behavior in foreign affairs, to express sharp criticism of American leadership. When I innocently mentioned the name of Chester Bowles, they actually cheered. The points of their concern were (1) our military aid to Pakistan, which country they seem to feel is not to be trusted to keep the peace, and (2) the inevitable question of race relations in America and the impossibility of reconciling our record of racial segregation and discrimination with the democracy which we are supposed to represent and to prove before the world.

The big issue in India-Pakistan relations, of course, is Kashmir. Both Governments are committed to a plebiscite on the part of the people of Kashmir for a decision as to which

of the two countries they will "join." The people of Kashmir are mostly Moslem, so it is presumed by most that a plebiscite would greatly favor Pakistan. The "Government" of Kashmir is presently pro-India. The Indian leaders (and the officials of Kashmir) have insisted for some time that a plebiscite cannot be held until Pakistan has a constitution. It has not been able to adopt one because of violent political antipathies and rivalries within the country (the extreme Moslem party insisting that the constitution should be strictly Islamic—based on the ancient Islamic codes of conduct with all their cruelties and inhumanities), until last week when Pakistan approved a considerably moderated Islamic constitution.

I imagine that the Kashmir question will now again be a source of great difficulty. There is real danger of a serious deterioration in relations between India and Pakistan. Already there is a renewal of border incidents. In the midst of this developing situation the United States extends military aid to Pakistan—an action which, despite promises and protestations about the nonaggressive use of the offered aid, is bound to be regarded by Indians as a hostile policy, a threat to India's safety and security.

Much to our surprise, we find that the issue of American aid to Pakistan is given more attention in our conversations with the people of India than the problem of race relations in America. This does not mean, however, that the American record of racial discrimination is no longer regarded as a major "truth" about America and a disgraceful revelation before the world. In every serious conversation the questions still are raised: What about Miss Lucy? Why are the public schools still segregated? What is America doing about discrimination? What are the churches doing? I cannot begin to tell how greatly, how widely and deeply, America's reputation is damaged and embarrassed, how far the cause of freedom (anti-Communism) is set back, by the well-known, universally advertised, and sometimes distorted facts regarding discriminations against Negro citizens in our country.

These problems were sharply in the focus of our discussion in the Progressive Club meeting on Saturday evening. When we left for our dinner appointment at 8 o'clock (the customary hour for the care and feeding of guests, we find), the discussion continued—but this time, as we learned later, it was mostly about us. The men were pleased (we were told by several of them afterward) and not a little impressed by (1) our enunciation of principles regarding international relations, (2) the fact that we did not try to explain or defend American foreign policies or racial segregation in America but listened sympathetically to everything the men had to say, and (3) our traveling together. (I believe Dr. Ralla Ram is planning to write to Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, our Stated Clerk, about what he believes to be the value and importance of our visit in India.)

Palm Sunday (March 25)—Both Frank and I had early (8:00 A.M.) preaching assignments. The

service in which I had a part was very well attended. The lovely, graceful girls (in their Sunday-best saris and scarves) of Mary Wanamaker School, carrying palm branches, formed a processional that I shall never forget. My interpreter was Dr. Caldwell Smith, who heads the Language and Orientation School for new missionaries. He is so adept that I am sure the people heard a much better sermon than I preached. Right at the end I got poetic, and that nearly threw him. The image I used would have been meaningless to the people in the church, but Dr. Smith skillfully turned it into an entirely different "picture" and came up with what I was told was the "punch line" of the entire sermon.

A most interesting experience a few days ago was our visit to the noted Indian Statistical Institute in the far outskirts of the city. Here (and at several outposts across the country) are plotted India's economic and social policies. About 1,200 persons constitute the personnel of the Institute, which is, I believe, unique in the world. Leaders in the social and physical sciences (mathematics, statistics) of many nations are invited to participate in the Institute—seminars, teaching, research, lectures, etc. The director of the huge enterprise is Dr. P. C. Mahalanobis, a most eminent physicist and statistician. He is the author of India's Second Five Year Plan which has lately been approved by the Government and set in motion. He was the subject last fall of a seriously unfair and misrepresentative article in *Time*.

We went to the apartment of Dr. A. Edwin Harper, Presbyterian missionary teacher on the faculty of Ewing Christian College in Allahabad, who is on leave from the college and is assisting in the development of a psychometric testing program (tests, standards, research, in the field of vocational testing and training) at the Institute. There we had a most delightful lunch. Dr. Harper had brought in several of his fellow workers, both Christians and Hindus. We met Dr. Weiner of M.I.T., an outstanding mathematician and statistician, and also a Dr. Shah, whose father is on the staff of Allahabad Agricultural Institute, a Dr. Mitra, and a Dr. Rudra—all exceedingly good men. The conversation was fast, high, and wide. It was mostly about India's vast problems—economic, social, political—and some of the present developments.

Then we went to the nearby home of Dr. Mahalanobis, met the great man, talked with him for nearly an hour over several cups of coffee, received from his hand autographed copies of a recent speech on "planning" and of the Second Five Year Plan for India.

There are only 30,000 industries in India (an industry being any manufacturing or processing business that employs 10 workers or more, with machinery, or 20 workers or more with no machinery). Of these, only 4,000 to 6,000 pay taxes, even though the exemption is only 900 rupees per year (about $190). Only 2,700,000 persons are employed in India's industries. Hence the emphasis on the development of home and small-scale industries. (It should be noted that India's "paying" industries are owned and controlled by a very small

group of people—200 or 300 families at the most, with a "hard core" of 40 families controlling the largest and most successful enterprises.)

One may wonder why a Christian missionary, Dr. Edwin Harper, is connected with the Indian Statistical Institute—a Government-subsidized operation seemingly far removed from the orbit of Christian activity. Dr. Harper explains it this way: "The Church is always seeking ways in which it can serve the nation. This is one way in which it can serve India as a whole, and in so doing also serve the specialized needs of the Christian Church. Before we went on furlough, there was a growing pressure for us to spend full time in psychological service on our return. When Professor Mahalanobis offered the facilities of the Institute for this work, in return for our setting up a psychological research unit, the Executive Committee of the North India Synodical Board—of which the principal of our Ewing Christian College was then president—voted to loan the Harpers for this special service."

Dr. Harper continues: "There are many ways in which psychological measurement can help the work of the Church, and they are the same as the ways in which we are serving India as a whole—by working out good tests for choosing students worthy of scholarships; by refining mechanical aptitude tests, so as to guide talented young men along this line; by constructing tests which will help college students choose courses more wisely; by helping our Christian medical schools with their excellent selection programs (since they can take less than one out of every ten applicants); by helping to set up selection tests for teacher-training institutions; by studying the validity of tests—how accurate they are as predictors of success; by publishing tests, so that they may be available to qualified users. . . . In a word, we see our work as an important Christian service to all India; we also see it as a vital element in the program for strengthening the lay leadership of the Christian Church."

Here we are in Delhi, and it is noon, March 28, 1956. I think it would be well for me to get this epistle in the mail before Dr. Kincaid arrives with his plans for the rest of the day. He met us at the train last evening, took us to the hotel, and said we were to be ready at 7:00 A.M. today for a tour of certain health projects in the outskirts of the city. We demurred, because of several matters of business we had to tend to this morning. Tomorrow we go to Agra and the Taj Mahal. On Friday or Saturday we *may* see the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru. On Saturday afternoon we shall go to Lahore, Pakistan, and then on to Jordan.

(Continued from page 20)

scientific farm methods, problems perhaps more far-reaching in their evil implications and which frequently lead to the other social ills, were on the whole rated as much less significant.

The data also reflects some interesting attitudes relative to the basic problem of land tenure. About 80 per cent of the students feel that the present landlord-tenant system is on the whole quite unsatisfactory and in need of radical reform. About 35 per cent believe that the tenants in their home area are treated unfairly by the landlords. Eighty-three per cent feel that it would be a good thing if the Protestant churches would work out an adequate land reform program in accordance with Christian ideals and submit it to Congress for legislative action.

There appears to be no significant difference in the attitudes of students whose families own fifty or more hectares of land and students whose families own no land. Indeed, on some issues students from the landed families show a more liberal attitude.

Christian Political Action

The area in which the students reflect the most conservative attitudes is the area of political action. It has already been indicated that a large percentage of the students rated political corruption as the gravest social evil of the nation. A rather pronounced lack of faith in the effectiveness of the Government is also reflected. For example, only about 36 per cent of the students feel that on the whole Government adequately enforces such laws as the Rice Share Tenancy Act and the Minimum Wage Law.

The feeling that politics is a dirty business undoubtedly conditions the prevalent attitude against Christian participation in politics. There is no clear-cut approval of the laity entering the political arena. Only 56 per cent would encourage a qualified member of their church to run for the office of congressman. Only 22 per cent feel it is proper for a parish church to sponsor a political rally where candidates of the parties are present and allowed to speak.

Marked reticence to engage in political party activity is also indicated. About 50 per cent feel that it is not proper for a church member to serve as a campaign manager for a party candidate. The vast majority of the students feel that it is better for church members to refuse to join or to become active in a political party and to remain independent voters.

The students reflect even more rigidly restrictive attitudes relative to the minister's role in politics. Eighty-two per cent feel that a minister should never join a political party or become active in its organization. Seventy-two per cent feel that the minister should not be permitted by his church to campaign as a private citizen for his chosen candidate. Over 75 per cent indicated approval of the minister discussing social and economic problems in the pulpit. However, when this question was put more specifically: Is it proper for the minister to discuss the ethical implications of the National-

ization Act in the pulpit?—only 42 per cent approved. The students indicated a marked antipathy to the minister's entering politics by running for a political office. Only 7 per cent would approve of a parish minister becoming a candidate.

In the minds of most of the students there is apparently little recognition of the minister as a private citizen distinct from his professional position. This attitude reflects a rather narrow estimate of the Protestant ministry. The apparent view is that an ordained minister is a true minister of the gospel only when he is serving as a parish pastor.

However, there does appear to be a more liberal view concerning the minister's relationship to the labor movement. Only 41 per cent indicated that they would tend to criticize a minister if he left the parish work to become a labor union leader if he felt that he could make a vital Christian contribution there.

Attitudes on Intercultural Relations

The questionnaire dealt in a cursory fashion with some intercultural problems. It is interesting to note that only 10 per cent of the students feel that the Nationalization Act is in accordance with basic Christian principles. It should be borne in mind, however, that 48 per cent indicated they did not possess sufficient knowledge about this matter to make a definite judgment, and in addition almost 20 per cent were undecided on the issue.

The students were quite evenly divided on the Japanese reparations issue. Almost 34 per cent feel that the Philippine Government ought to continue to demand reparation from Japan. Thirty-seven per cent feel that the Philippines ought not make any more financial demands upon Japan.

The attitudes toward the Chinese and Moros seem, from a Christian point of view, to be rather wholesome. Only 10 per cent of the students were willing to agree that on the whole the Moros are untrustworthy. Over 97 per cent indicated they would wholeheartedly welcome and encourage Chinese Christians to join their churches. This does not mean that theological students are necessarily free from prejudice toward minority groups. Numerous firmly established stereotypes, especially in regard to the Chinese, have been reflected by students in the writer's classes in social ethics.

Conclusions

One cannot survey the results of this study with anything but mixed feelings. In some areas the theological students reflect healthy attitudes, in other relationships alarmingly narrow viewpoints. But one of the encouraging revelations of the study is the indication that as a student progresses through the four years of his study and his year of parish internship, his ideas and attitudes tend to broaden. A comparative study of the attitudes of freshmen and seniors indicates that in general the graduating class possessed much more wholesome social views than did the beginning students. Furthermore, the seniors tended to have more decided opinions, reflected less indecision, and possessed wider knowledge of the issues involved. A few examples will suffice to indicate the trend.

Ninety-two per cent of the seniors thought that the church should work to change the economic system of the Philippines where it deviates from the Christian ideal, while only 58 per cent of the freshmen held this view. One hundred per cent of the seniors favored the Protestant churches' working out an adequate land reform program, whereas only 62 per cent of the freshmen favored this.

In one place the students were asked to indicate which of two suggested projects they thought would be more important and fruitful for a local church to undertake: preparing baskets of food for needy families at Christmas time, or sponsoring a meeting in which a Government agricultural adviser would discuss scientific farm methods. One hundred per cent of the seniors felt that the agricultural instruction would be more important, while 30 per cent of the freshmen thought that the Christmas charity projects would be more significant. Sixty-four per cent of the seniors advocated a radical land reform program as over against 32 per cent of the freshmen.

In the area of political action the seniors again reflected a much broader attitude. Eighty-five per cent would encourage a qualified layman to run for office, but only 41 per cent of the freshmen indicated they would encourage this. A much higher percentage of seniors favored the minister joining a political party, becoming active in party organization, or running for office. More seniors favored such projects as credit unions, co-operative farms, a planned parenthood program, and social study groups than did the freshmen.

The broader attitudes of the graduating class indicate that the present curriculum in the Silliman College of Theology has been to some degree effective in instilling within the students a more adequate outlook relative to Christian social action. However, many of the results of the study would point to the apparent need to strengthen the curriculum in the areas of social ethics and community action. During the school year 1954-1955, a new course in social ethics was offered for the first time. In this course the principles and ideals of the Christian gospel are consciously related to the basic contemporary social problems in the general areas of international, intercultural, and interracial relationships, and in the economic and political order. Another course, The Church and the Rural Community, has been offered for some time. Yet in comparison with the courses in these areas offered by other theological schools, this is extremely inadequate.

Of course it is not only in specialized courses that a social consciousness can be emphasized. In other sections of the theological curriculum a conscious effort can be made to have the social implications of the Christian faith discussed.

It is obvious that only ministers with progressive outlooks, with deep social concerns, with basic knowledge about the techniques of social change, will be able to lead the Church out of its isolated, irrelevant status into a situation where it can make a dynamically vital contribution to the well-being of society. This is one of the compelling and challenging tasks of theological education in the Philippines today.

Echoes

The response to the February issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS has been so spirited and stimulating that we should like to share a cross section of it with our readers.

I look forward to reading our SEA magazine each month. I find it informative and provocative.

"Colloquy on a Library Card" is one of the best things your staff has done. It is "glorious in its concreteness." I was particularly impressed by Jean Russell's comments in "He Should Have Educated the Session." I question seriously the inclusion of the article "He Should Have Had Artillery," by Spencer Coxe.

What I question about the article is the vocabulary and the undertone of self-righteousness. How often in my youthful "liberal" days I heard phrases like: "the classic struggle between the *haves* and the *have-nots*," "*stupid* and *entrenched* conservatism on one hand and *enlightenment* on the other." These are Marxist-like clichés. They are based on the assumption that one group is "all bad" and the other "all good."

Now, you must think me a reactionary. The trouble is that I am not. I thank God for men like Mr. Everhart—especially for mature ones who see the right and are willing, under God's judgment, to fight for it.

—William S. Rowling
Scranton, Pa.

I think Mr. Everhart was very, very foolish. Let me introduce myself. I shall be seventy years of age in twenty-one days and shall retire from the active ministry at the end of June.

Previous to this charge I occupied a number of small ones. In many places there was a library rule similar to the one complained of. In this town, when I came here, the rural pastors could not get books from the library at all, because they were "out of the corporation." I circumvented that by getting the books charged to me, to my wife, to my children, and lending them to the rural brethren.

My session was rigidly conservative and after twenty years most of the members still are. But, I get all sorts of privileges. When there is a criminal trial at the courthouse I get accommodated with a seat with the lawyers. The bank lends me money without an endorser. The doctors don't send a bill.

I had one row with the school superintendent just after I came here. I "backed down" and got him elected an elder soon after. He went to another charge fifteen years ago but we correspond still. The new superintendent is even worse. But he gets my mimeographing done by the students without charge.

Don't fight. Don't be a nuisance. Don't make a stink. Then when you

do retire perhaps they will pass a resolution [of commendation] like they did for me, last month.

(Name withheld by editors)

My first reaction, as many others will probably have, was "never has so much been said by so many about so little," but I caught eventually amidst the minutia a familiar aria "about the principle of the thing," that has rung loudly in myself a time or two.

In all the "advice" I felt there was a lack of sympathy with the frustrating factor that because of its very littleness, a committee to investigate would have been more "administrivia à la devia" (like having a committee to see if the janitor turned the water off in the kitchen). How did you know he was going to make an issue out of it? To take such an attitude is to assume a suspicion about everyone.

—Myron L. Wheeler
Savannah, Mo.

There is another issue in this too. If there has grown up a class distinction between the owners and the nonowners of real estate, is the fault all on one side? Most of my life I have lived in rented or church-owned houses, and so I do not speak from the point of view of a well-to-do property owner. The tone of Mr. Everhart's account is that the property owners are all at fault and have set themselves up as a higher class scorning or suspecting the nonowners, and condescending to live in the same community with them just because life is like that.

But what is the record of the nonowners as stewards, not just of library books, but of other community or private property? Have they maintained a high sense of responsibility for keeping up the lawn, protecting nicely finished floors, and leaving the house clean when they leave? Or have they helped to establish what is too often the record of leaving a mess for the landlord or the next tenant to clean up? One could go on in this vein, and find reason for another crusade in the direction of personal responsibility on the part of nonowners and owners alike, which would be considerably larger and deeper in its scope than the library card crusade.

Mr. Everhart has taken a necessary practical rule as an affront to a large class of people which by fact or association includes himself. And in so doing he is in danger of widening the gap rather than closing it. Perhaps he feels he *should* widen it! He refers to "my mere suggestion." There is nothing "mere" about two letters and a reasoned argument.

(Name withheld by editors)

Commentators Heinze, Coxe, and Russell are certainly not unsympathetic to Donald Everhart. I don't question their motivation or their sincere Christian love and admiration for the young minister. I hope they will all help him find another job when the one he has falls apart. I think Everhart was right and Heinze, Coxe, and Russell are wrong. The young man knew that something ought to be done. Had he taken advantage of his position as pastor, and organized a committee, he would have been criticized for that. Everhart didn't try to pull rank on anyone, but proceeded as a plain,

ordinary Christian citizen. As for educating his session first, I suspect he knew how futile that would be in a community where social criteria are sub-Christian and entrenched. It is commendable that he didn't come out swinging wildly. He proceeded with becoming caution and courtesy. It was not a small matter—*no* moral issue is—and it demanded attention. The pity is that other Christians, both clergy and laymen, didn't back him up so completely that the moral position of the community would have become clear to more people.

One would like to make a running commentary on the advice and counsel given to Mr. Everhart by his comforters. However, I will comment on only one statement . . . the one whose implications are possibly most dangerous. Mrs. Russell says that if Mr. Everhart is at all serious in raising the question of leaving the ministry, then he should do so. It would be difficult to find poorer counsel about the vocation of the Christian ministry. I have known a few ministers who never once raised the question of their own fitness for the ministry. In my experience, such self-satisfied clergymen are smug shams. Mr. Everhart's fitness is not assured by the fact that he *does* ask the question, but his failure to ask the question would certainly disqualify him. My belief about one's "call" to the ministry is quite orthodox, but only the naïve or the smug would be able to be forever certain that they were fulfilling all the requirements of the call.

I am afraid that the story of Mr. Everhart's experience, as related in SOCIAL PROGRESS, and the formidable comments on how he should have proceeded will frighten some timid clergymen away from Christian action and thus serve the purpose of those who are trying to silence the Church.

—E. Paul Conine
Billings, Mont.

Your recent article "Colloquy on a Library Card" was most interesting and worth-while. Mr. Everhart is to be commended for his sense of social justice. But it seems to me that there is an important element that was not mentioned.

There comes a time in social conflict when the Christian must resort to organized attack against existing evil, great or small (the size of the issue is immaterial). One of the advisers suggested that he should have organized soon in the proceedings. This automatically precipitates organized resistance, and from this point on the possibility of influencing the "opponent" is lost.

I feel that the first responsibility of the Christian minister is to influence the leaders to become the social reformers themselves.

First of all he should have gotten his card, so that it was not a personal issue. Then to have pointed out to the doctor or other members of the board that there was a social injustice. They would probably have been quite willing to change the ruling if it would not appear that they were forced to do so by the *young* minister. They would have gotten the credit then for having done the democratic thing, and would have been won from the side of the "status quoists" to the side of social reformers.

—Rev. Ralph Parvin
Henryville, Ind.

Have you seen—

Compassion Is Not Enough, the new Department leaflet that tells of SEA's goals, responsibilities, and program. Free.

Putting Ethyl in Her Place, a sequel to *Ethyl Is Not a Lady.* 25 copies, 75 cents; 100 copies, $2.50.

Questions for Christians in 1956, containing suggestions for churchmen at election time. Single copy, 10 cents; 10-100 copies, 5 cents.

All available from your nearest Presbyterian Distribution Service.

Quantity Rates

Single Issue Orders

Single copy	15 cents
5—10 copies	10 cents each
11—24 copies	8 cents each
25 or more copies	6 cents each

Group Subscriptions (to *one* address)

5—10 yearly subscriptions	80 cents each
11—100 yearly subscriptions	60 cents each

Club Subscriptions (to *separate* addresses)

5—10 yearly subscriptions	90 cents each
11—100 yearly subscriptions	75 cents each

Allow 2 months for new subscriptions

MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
CHINA
KOREA
JAPAN
AFGHANISTAN
PAKISTAN
NEPAL
INDIA
PAKISTAN
BURMA
LAOS
THAILAND
CAMBODIA
VIET-NAM
HONG KONG
TAIWAN (FORMOSA)
PACIFIC
OCEAN
PHILIPPINES
CEYLON
NO. BORNEO
BRUNEI
SARAWAK
FED. OF MALAYA
SINGAPORE
SULAWESI (CELEBES)
KALIMANTAN (BORNEO)
INDIAN
OCEAN